Mr. K. C. Raja Raja Varma and Mr. V. Subba Aiyar to be the members of the Select Committee. The time required for submitting the report is three months.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Does the House agree to the proposition that a Select Committee may be composed of the members mentioned by Mr. Subba Aiyar with power to report on the Bill within three months?

The motion was accepted.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I appoint Mr. Subba Aiyar as the Chairman of the Select Committee.

THE MUNICIPAL REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I understand that some of the municipal authorities would like to have one or two more amendments in the Bill. Though the Bill itself is put down for introduction, I would be satisfied if the Council would grant me leave to further amend the Municipal Regulation.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I suppose the House grants leave to introduce more amendments in the Bill than at present. It is apparently defective in the judgment of some municipal authorities and Mr. Subba Aiyar wants permission to introduce it at a later stage.

Leave was granted and the Bill withdrawn.

THE LAND CONSERVANCY REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Sir, I beg to move that the Land Conservancy Regulation Amendment Bill be read in Council.

MR. R. KRISHNA PILLAI: I second it.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Sir, the Bill proposes in the first instance to include within its category certain lands within Edavagais or Estates which are governed by the Rent Recovery Regulation. Why they are proposed to be included is this. Under the Rent Recovery Regulation every holder of land within Edavagais has got all the rights which he would have as a holder under Government. The properties are surveyed and settled by Government and the Edavagais are only entitled to the rent so settled. In the case of unregistered lands in these Edavagais it was represented to Government that the proprietors were put to considerable difficulty in the matter of evicting trespassers upon unregistered lands. Inasmuch as the tenants of the Edavagais enjoy the same privileges as holders under Government, they requested protection under the Land Conservancy Regulation. The Bill proposes to give effect to that request of the proprietors of Edavagais.

Then the next portion of the amendment is included under subclause (2) of Section 3. It says, among others, that all unassigned lands belonging to an unincorporated Devaswom under the sole management of Government shall be deemed to be the property of Government. All incorporated Devaswom lands are now treated under the Devaswom Proclamation as Pandaravagai lands. The protection that was originally meant to be given to incorporated Devaswom lands under the Land

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. Parameswaran Pillai.]

Conservancy Regulation is now given by the Devaswom Proclamation. But unincorporated Devaswóm lands have not been provided for, and it is these lands that are proposed to be included in the present Bill.

The next provision relates to the much-vexed and contested question of appeals to the Dewan from the Peishkar. It is proposed to make the Land Revenue Commissioner the appellate authority.

There are thus two amendments included in the Bill—one to give protection to the Edavagais and to unincorporated Devaswoms, and the other to provide for appeals from the decisions of the Peishkar to the Land Revenue Commissioner. These are the two matters that are proposed in the Bill and they are sufficiently explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. With these words, I move that the principle of the Bill be taken into consideration.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I am sorry that I have to oppose the Bill. So far as the appeal to the Land Revenue Commissioner is concerned, the objection that was urged in respect of the Markets Regulation Amendment Bill will apply. I do not want to waste the time of the Council by referring to that again.

So far as the other provision is concerned, it is very curious that these Edavagais want all the advantages of this Regulation in regard to waste lands, the collection of their dues, and all manner of things, while they are not willing to give their tenants the same advantages that they want to take. For instance, the tenants of these Edavagais have been, I know, agitating for a long time past that they may also be given the benefit of the commutation of paddy payments into money payments. Now this is what Regulation IV of 1068 says:

> The holders of land in the Estates of Kilimanur and Edappalli shall have the same rights in respect of their holdings as the holders of land under Our Government.
>
> The rent recoverable from the holders of land in the said Estates shall be at the rates assessed by Our Government from time to time.
>
> The granting of waste lands shall be regulated in respect of permanency of occupation and the rates of assessment by the laws and rules for the time being in force for Government waste lands".

Again Section 6 says:

> "The rents due to these Estates shall be treated as public revenue and all arrears shall be recovered by Our officers in the manner prescribed by Regulation I of 1068, subject to such rules as may be prescribed by Our Government from time to time."

So that they have got the benefit of the Revenue Recovery Regulation, and the granting of waste lands to be regulated according to their demands; and many other rights they have, by means of which they can, as ordinary landlords, enforce their rights. By a personal request made to me by the tenants of the Kallupara *pakuthi*, which is under the Edapalli Chief, I interpellated Government as follows:

> "Will the Government be pleased to say why the benefit of the commutation of tax in kind into money payment was not extended to the Kallupara *pakuthi* ?"

The answer was:

> "The major portion of the Kallupara *pakuthi* is comprised by the freehold land of the Edapalli Chief. The scheme abolishing the system of payment of tax in kind is an

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

administrative measure affecting only the lands under the Sirkar and it is not binding on the Edapalli Chief."

And with respect to the next parts of the question as to whether it was due to the fact that the *pakuthi* belonged to the Edapalli Chief that the Government had no power to grant the tenants the right of such commutation, and, if it was so, whether the Government would take such power by legislation, the answer was in the negative. That is to say, those tenants are not entitled to the same rights as tenants under Government. In regard to the Edavagais, so far as waste lands are concerned, they must be treated just like the lands of other owners, who have not leased out their lands, and the civil court will settle all disputes between the parties. There is absolutely no reason why the Government should interfere with them. If, on the other hand, Government seeks to interfere, they must be prepared to give sovereign rights to the holders of these lands as to the holders of waste lands under Government. For these reasons, I oppose the Bill.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: With reference to incorporated Devaswom lands, what have you to say?

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: They may be under a different footing; even, with regard to them I oppose the principle of this Bill.

MR. V. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I stand to support Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai. There is no necessity for such a Bill at present. Mr. Subba Aiyar in the Statement of Objects and Reasons says (1) "The *proprietors* of the Estates etc." I take objection to the word "proprietors" of the Estates. The kind of tenure of land in Kilimanur in the Chirayinkil taluk is obvious. In answer to my question of to-day about it, the Chief Secretary to Government was unable to state the nature of the tenure. So far as I know, the lands are Pandaravagai tenure and the tax-payers are "land holders" as any other subjects of the State. The owners of Edavagais have no right to evict a tax-payer. Regulation IV of 1068 was created simply to give some facility to the Edapalli Chief and Kilimanur Koiltampurans to collect their public revenue through Government agency, *i. e.*, through the Tahsildars of their respective taluks. Regulation IV of 1068 governs Pandaravagai lands within the Estates and nothing more. Secondly, Mr. Subba Aiyar says "the unauthorised occupation of waste lands in Edavagais." Again I must say that the land-holders have got the same rights and privileges as other subjects under Government. Regulation IV of 1068 clearly contemplates that right. Lastly, the Law Member says that the present system "does not give adequate protection". I ask to whom? This view of Mr. Subba Aiyar is really injurious to the public and the Government. The owners of the Estate may very well fight out their cases by civil and criminal weapons. The contemplated Bill is irksome by all means. I have one point more to bring forward, and that is that the owners of Edavagais are not prepared to collect their revenue as per *ayacut*, *i. e.*, Sircar accounts. They still insist on tax-payers to pay their tax in kind. The tax-payers.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. J. John Nidiry.]

have been sending memorial after memorial to Government for the commutation of their tax, into 11 chs. per *para* of paddy. If the Government cannot help the tax-payer in this respect, how can the Government help the Edavagais by introducing this Bill? Almost all unassessed lands in the Edavagais are in the occupation of poor subjects who have effected vast improvements, say 50 or 60 years old. Big trees and old buildings can be seen in the reclaimed lands. For all these reasons I would advocate that this Bill should not be read in Council and that it should be thrown out.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: Sir, I am for all possible protection being granted to all the subjects of His Highness the Maha Raja. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, I find it said that the Edavagai authorities approached Government and that the Government had promised them special protection. I should like to know, in the course of the Law Member's reply, the circumstances under which such protection was sought and the nature of the protection that has been promised. So far as the principle goes, I cannot see any difference between waste lands owned by Edavagais and waste lands owned by private land-holders. In respect of assessed lands the Edavagais certainly do not stand in need of any protection, because these lands are in the possession of the holders who have to pay tax to the Edavagai and, if any body trespasses upon their holdings, they have the right to protect themselves by going to the criminal or the civil courts of the country. In respect of waste lands, the Edavagais are not in a better position than any private land-owner, as some of them may have as much, if not more, waste lands than the Edavagais themselves. Some of these Edavagais hold lands not merely in their own name, but also in the names of Devaswoms belonging to them. Whether the protection sought is with respect to such holdings is a matter not explained by the mover. As I started with saying, I am for protection, and all manner of protection for all the subjects of His Highness the Maha Raja. But I am not for any invidious distinction being made between noblemen and plebians.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: I am sorry I also have to oppose the Bill in *toto*. The learned Law Member has not been able to make out a clear case for the interference of the legislature to protect the so-called interests of the Edavagais. Simply because the Edavagai authorities wanted protection or wanted some change in the present law, we would not be justified in accepting it as a sufficient ground for the Legislative Council to interfere in the matter. Mr. Subba Aiyar ought to have given us facts and figures and satisfied us that there was a real necessity for the proposed change. Though I was very carefully listening to his speech, I am not at all satisfied with the necessity for our interference at present. Further, have the Government or the Law Member bestowed any thought on the interests of the tenants before they came forward with this piece of legislation? I do not think that it would be a right course on the part of the Law Member or other members

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

to allow the amendment under consideration, because the Edavagai authorities wanted some protection against the tenants. Under these circumstances, we are not in a position to grant the protection sought by the Edavagai authorities. Since my learned friend, Mr. Subba Aiyar, has not been able to convince me of the necessity for our interference in the matter, I strongly oppose the principle of the Bill.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: In this debate concerning necessity for speedy legislative protection, which has been sought by the Edavagais concerned, certain aspects of the question involved have not been placed before the House. When the Rent Recovery Regulation was passed by the Travancore Legislative Council and became law, these Edavagais were deprived of their freedom of action and involuntarily made to conform to the ways of Government; that is to say, with the facility created for the collection of arrears of rent, permanent rights of occupancy were conferred on the tenants of the Edavagai properties, just as fixity of tenure was granted to the holders of *Venpattam* properties under the Sirkar, by enacting the Pattam Proclamation of 1040. Then, during the settlement operations, the measures that were adopted with respect to Government lands were analogously applied to these Edavagai lands. In the matter of the realisation of the rent, or the tax, due from the Edavagai tenants, the Revenue Recovery Regulation is being employed at the instance of the Edavagai Chiefs through the agency of the revenue officers of the taluks. In all these respects the Edavagai lands have been treated quite on lines parallel to Pandarapattam lands. These Edavagais, as I said, have been deprived of their own freedom of dealing with their tenants to a very considerable extent by the statute law of the State.

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR: May I know if it was against their own wish, or against their own consent?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: It could not have been in fulfilment of their wishes. The speech of the late Mr. Thanu Pillai in introducing the Rent Recovery Regulation may be referred to in this connection. He points out there that it was entirely in conformity with the pre-existing custom that the Regulation was introduced. He points out that it was in the interests of the holders of land in these Estates as much as the Estates themselves that the legislature proposed to define and settle the law by the enactment. It cannot be denied that the balance of advantage lies with the tenants under this Regulation. So I say when the State thought that it should step into the domain of private rights of contract, usually regulated by the agreements of parties, when the State thought that legislation should be resorted to to perpetuate permanent rights of tenancy in the properties of these Edavagais by curtailing the scope for eviction, then certainly the State undertook a duty towards the proprietors of those Edavagais to safeguard their interests by appropriate means.

MR. DOMINIC TOMMAN: May I ask Mr. Narayana Pillai why the other Edavagais were left out?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai.]

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : What are the other Edavagais, please ?

MR. DOMINIC TOMMAN : Vanjipuzha, Poonjar and others.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI : I am only concerned with these two Edavagais—the Kilimanur and Edappalli Edavagais. The others do not come under the Rent Recovery Regulation and, therefore, they are not entitled to any protection. Only two Edavagais allowed themselves to be placed under or controlled by the statute law of the land ; naturally, a corresponding duty has been undertaken by Government in the matter of protecting the rights of these Edavagais. If the holders of land in these two Edavagais are entitled to the same privileges as in Sirkar lands, it is only logical to contend that they should be subject to similar liabilities also.

There was another point referred to by Mr. K. Parameswaran Pillai. It was with respect to the paddy portion of the kist that has to be collected in these Edavagais. So far as the Kalluppara Edavagai is concerned, the portion of rent to be collected as paddy is not, I think a very great quantity. There are certain Devaswom lands also in this Edavagai. These stand on a different footing. The Rent Recovery Regulation exempts Devaswom lands from the operation of that statute. Further, this point of difference noticed by my friend is quite easy to answer ; for even Government have not abolished kist in kind completely. Does it not yet survive in the Kandukrishi Department? The question is in what respects do the Edavagai lands substantially differ from Government lands ? On all essential points the Edavagai lands have been assimilated to Government lands. In these circumstances, the amendment seems to be reasonable ; but I am not prepared to grant it without conditions. What the Edavagai chiefs want is the assistance of the officers of the State in the matter of eviction in cases of unauthorised occupation of unregistered lands. That entails additional duties on the Tahsildars and other officers who have to take action under the Land Conservancy Regulation. What is the return the Edavagai authorities are prepared to make for this service ? If they are prepared to make a fair return for the service placed at the disposal of the Edvagai authorities, then I think, in view of the existing relations, the amendment may be granted and the Bill may be allowed to be read and passed in Council. But not otherwise. For the betterment of the conditions of the Edavagais, the services which are maintained at the expense of the common public purse should not be utilised unconditionally. On this condition, I am prepared to agree with my friend, the learned Law Member. An estimate should be made as to what would be a fair return for the services lent by the Government for the purposes of the proprietors of these Edavagais.

As to the unincorporated Devaswom lands under the control of Government, I see practically no difficulty in allowing the proposed

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

measure, because Government are in the position of trustees with respect to these institutions. Considering the peculiar position of the Travancore State towards these institutions, it is better that a speedy remedy for the eviction of unauthorised occupants is provided for.

MR. K. DOMINIC TOMMAN: Is it only against the lessees of these Devaswoms that he wants to take remedy?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: That may be extended to trespassers also.

Then there is the question of appeal. I have already expressed my view in connection with the Markets Regulation Amendment Bill; and the same views need only be emphatically repeated in this connection. Mr. Krishna Aiyar is just putting me the question, why not the Land Conservancy Regulation be extended to his property also? I think it may be extended, provided that he is willing to place himself under the Rent Recovery Regulation.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Exactly!

MR. K. DOMINIC TOMMAN: Sir, the Land Conservancy Regulation is the most unpopular of the enactments in the Travancore Statute Book. The working of this Regulation causes the greatest hardship and trouble to the rich as well as to the poor. This matter was brought to the notice of the Government in several sessions of the Popular Assembly. So when it was heard that the Land Conservancy Regulation was to be amended, people naturally thought that some relaxation in their favour would be made in its provisions. But instead of that, we are now told that two more classes of land are to be included in the category of Government lands in sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Regulation.

One of them is Edavagai lands belonging to the Kilimanur and Edappalli Chiefs. These Chiefs themselves are the subjects of His Highness the Maha Raja, just as their tenants who occupy the Edavagai lands. These lands are admittedly private lands. The reasons given in the Statement of Objects and Reasons are that they have got large areas to be conserved, that they may have to file numerous cases in civil courts, that the delay and expenses incidental to litigation would be out of all proportion to the benefits that may result, and that the systems of land settlement and land records are similar to those of Government villages and the holders of land in the Edavagais have the same rights as holders of Government lands. It is also said that the proprietors of these Edavagais have asked for such protection. These reasons are too weak to deprive a subject of his civil rights. If these reasons hold good, there are other proprietors of Edavagais who own equally large or even larger areas, like the Vanjipuzha and the Poonjar Chiefs. There are proprietors of Government lands who own a larger extent of land than any of the proprietors of these Edavagais, like the Kannan Devan Hills Company of the High Ranges, owning 217 square miles of land in one block, who may also

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. C. Raja Raja Varma.]

ask for the protection of the Government to exempt them from the trouble of resorting to civil courts to evict trespassers from their lands.

Nobody would admit that it is a desirable state of affairs to deprive the civil court of its jurisdiction in the case of large estate proprietors. Apart from the merits of the case, the alleged unauthorised occupant may have made improvements on the land. By a summary ejection under this Regulation, he loses the benefit of getting the value of the improvements effected by him. Moreover, it is not a sound policy on the part of the Government to give the strong undue advantage over the weak when they have an equal right to fight out their differences in a civil court.

The case of the incorporated Devaswom lands is still worse. The Land Conservancy Regulation is intended to evict unauthorised occupants out of Sirkar lands. In the case of the unincorporated Devasoms, the Sirkar is only a trustee. So, the lands are not Sirkar lands. Moreover, it is said that the provision is necessary to evict lessees who refuse to go out when they are required to quit on the expiry of the period of lease. There the lessee entered upon the land under a contract. He is neither a trespasser nor an unauthorised occupant. He may have his *bona fide* contentions about the value of his improvements, etc. It is very hard on such poor lessees to be deprived of the protection of the civil court. I therefore strongly oppose the principle of the Bill.

MR. K. C. RAJA RAJA VARMA: Sir, before I proceed to deal with the various points raised by my friends, I shall place before the House the circumstances under which the Edavagais were forced to request the legislature to extend the provisions of the Regulation to their tracts also. For this purpose I would request my friends to bear with me if I give them a short description of the relationship existing between the holders of the Edavagais and the people living therein and also of the management of these Edavagais. I am afraid the fears and misgivings expressed by some of my friends about the conduct of these Edavagais proceed from want of opportunity to know the actual state of affairs existing in these places. I think I shall able to convince the House that there is no ground for any such fears and that the grant of the present request of the Edavagais, which I shall prove to be quite modest and reasonable, will only conduce to promote the best interests of the tenants, the Government and the Edavagais concerned.

Under the circumstances in which the Edavagais are placed, I submit that this is the only course open to them, *viz.*, to place a check on the unauthorised encroachments on their unassessed lands and the wilful destruction of the forests in those areas. Their request in this matter is quite distinct from that of a private landowner to extend these provisions to his lands which are in his actual possession and enjoyment. The holders of the Edavagais do not hold the lands comprised in the Eda-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

vagais under any tenure prescribed by the revenue laws. They do not hold these lands either under the Pandarapattam or jenmom tenure, the two primary tenures of this country. Their position in respect of these tracts is closely analogous to that of the Government in respect of lands in the Government *pakuthies*. They are only entitled to the various items of revenue which may be collected under the authority of the Government. As regards the position of the Edavagais, I shall read out, Sir, with your permission, a passage from the speech delivered by one of the most eminent administrators and statesmen of this country who always placed the interests of the people and the Government over everything else—I mean the late Dewan Shungrasubbier—in the Legislative Council, when it was considering the desirability of the application of the Revenue Recovery Regulation to the recovery of the rents or dues from the Edavagais. The passage runs thus:

"The recovery of revenue falling in arrears on the lands to which the amendment applies has been all along effected through the intervention of Government and by Government officers. The practice has all the legal validity which a well-recognised and immemorial custom can impart to it. What is now intended is nothing more than to leave this practice undisturbed.

What right is involved in and represented by this practice it is not competent to the legislature to nullify on the ground of a fresh codification in the interest of Government revenue.

In the case of Sripadam and Kilimanur, the right must be one inherent with the grant or assignment of the estates. In the case of Edapalli, it is, I believe, the condition brought about by the absorption of Edapalli's regal rights. What power the Chief had is now exercised by the Government on his behalf.

The estates concerned are not on the footing of Jenmi properties. The Jenmi Proclamation does not apply to them. The revenue on the lands comprised within the estates is not of the character of rents but precisely of the nature of regal tax on Government tenures. It is fixed on the same principles which are followed in the settlement of Government land revenue. The scale of assessment rates sanctioned for Government villages is applied to these estates as well. The present Revenue Settlement has been extended to the Sripadam and Kilimanur Estates and final pattahs are now being issued.

By a well-recognised customary law, the lands within the Estates once settled along with Government lands are not liable to any revision of assessment at the pleasure of the assignees, *viz.*, the Sripadam and the Edavagai Chiefs. The revision can take place only at a general settlement applying to the whole State.

The *puduval* lands in the Estates are registered on the same principles and rates governing the Settlement of Government *puduvals*.

The Royal Proclamation which authorised the levy of transfer fees on pattam lands was extended to the lands of the Estates under notice and when the fees were subsequently abolished, the abolition affected these estates also.

There are thousands of ryots holding properties in these Estates and paying revenue by instalments regulated in the same way as in Government villages. In many cases, the annual payments may not be more than a few chackrams. To leave out these Estates from the scope of the present Bill would be tantamount to a declaration to the numerous ryots concerned that Government would no longer enforce the recovery of the arrears legitimately due from them, but leave the parties to civil action. This must of course bring matters to a standstill. The revenue administration of the lands concerned, involving, as it does, the necessity of a civil suit in every case of arrear, say even a chackram, would become anything but practicable."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Hoogewerf.]

This passage, Sir, makes it clear that there is a great distinction between a private land owner and the Edavagai holders with respect to lands comprised within their tracts. Within the Edavagais, we have got pandarapattam lands both assessed and unassessed, jenmom lands held by jenmies, poramboke lands and forests. All these are classified in the Government Settlement Registers as registered plots, waste lands or തരിശ്, *porambokes* and forest or കാട്ടരിശ്. Their rights over these are different. For the purpose of the settlement and the land revenue administration, these *pakuthies* are treated by the Government exactly as their own *pakuthies* and are controlled by them under the provisions of Regulation IV of 1068. The people in these tracts hold their lands exactly under the same tenure and securities of law as the people in Government *pakuthies* hold theirs, and fresh cultivations of waste and other lands are brought under registry only under the Puduval Rules. The provertikars of these *pakuthies* exercise their functions under the authority and control of the Tahsildar. They are forced by laws to keep all the accounts and all the other records bearing upon the land under the direct supervision of the Tahsildar and as enjoined by the rules of the Land Revenue Department. The Tahsildar inspects the *pakuthi* cutcherries and reports. They have to submit all the statements and reports called for by the Tahsildars, and to attend to the multifarious duties imposed upon the provertikars in Government *pakuthies*. I submit that, so far as the management of these *pakuthies* is concerned, Government have got, under the provisions of Regulation IV of 1068, a direct control over them, and the Edavagais hold them subject to the conditions imposed by this Regulation and the other land revenue laws of the country.

This is what the Regulation says:

"The holders of land in the Estates of Kilimanur and Edappalli shall have the same rights in respect of their holding as the holders of land under Our Government.

The rent recoverable from the holders of land in the said Estates shall be at the rates assessed by Our Government from time to time.

The granting of waste lands shall be regulated, in respect of permanency of occupation and the rates of assessment, by the law and rules for the time being in force for Government waste lands.

The rent-roll and other accounts bearing upon the land shall be kept in the form in which Our Government accounts are kept, and they shall be subject to the supervision of Our Government.

The rents due to these Estates shall be treated as public revenue, and all arrears shall be recovered by Our officers in the manner prescribed by Regulation I of 1068 subject to such Rules as my be prescribed by Our Government from time to time."

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: I beg to know from the member whether the tenants in these Edavagais pay taxes in kind or in money.

MR. K. C. RAJA RAJA VARMA: A portion in kind, and the other portion in money.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Is there any difference between the tenants in these lands and those occupying Government lands?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: As regards Government lands, by an adminstrative order, the paddy portion of the tax is converted into money at the rate of eleven chuckrams per *para*. As regards the Edavagai lands, according to the rates fixed at the time of the last settlement, the money portion is recovered as money and the paddy portion as paddy.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Thank you.

MR. K. C. RAJA RAJA VARMA: My submission in this case is that the House should consider the broad aspect of the question and say whether the amendment as proposed is intended only to improve the condition of the Edavagais. It is not very much in the interest of the Edavagai holders either pecuniarily or otherwise that the present amendment is proposed.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: May I know if there is any demand on the part of the tenants of the Edavagais to hold their lands?

MR. K. C. RAJA RAJA VARMA: I shall come to that later on. As the whole of the revenue jurisdiction is already vested in Government officers, and as the proposed amendment also gives the powers only to highly-paid officers of Government, there is no possibility of the Edavagais exercising any influence against the interests of the tenants. I submit that this amendment is introduced in the interests of all the parties concerned. The Edavagais have got large tracts as forests which are necessary to be kept as forests; for if efficient check could not be given to the unauthorised encroachment on or the wilful destruction of these, the people living in the Edavagais would find it extremely difficult to get fuel, green manure, grass, etc. which are absolutely necessary for their household purposes and for the purpose of cultivating their lands; while the Edavagais would lose any income which they might get from the trees or other forest produce. If Government forests also exist adjoining or touching the Edavagai forests, as we find both in the Edappalli and Kilimanur Edavagais, the absence of efficient laws restricting the unauthorised encroachments or destruction or removal of trees or other forest produce in the Edavagais are taken advantage of by mischievous people to extend their unlawful activities to the forests on the other side and thereby to cause loss to the Government too. Similarly, in the case of Edavagai *porambokes*, such as banks and beds of rivers, channels, pathways, lanes, tanks, etc., they are invariably entered in the Settlement Registers as *porambokes*, but the proprietory rights of which are vested in the Edavagais, I hope the House will agree with me in thinking that in most cases they are to be conserved as such and any encroachments or occupations of the same which create inconveniences to the people should be promptly removed. In the cases of unassessed waste lands also, the same difficulties are being felt. My friends might ask me, why not resort to the ordinary penal laws of the land? It is not possible to detect all encroachments or unauthorised occupations in all the nooks and corners of the Edavagais

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. C. Raja Raja Varma.]

within the short period of three months within which complaints must be filed before the Magistrate. If the trespassers succeed in proving that their trespass was more than three months old, the case is thrown out, and the accused are given the liberty to enjoy the fruits of breaking the law until the Edavagais establish their title to the land in question in the civil courts which take considerable time and difficulty, often out of all proportion to the benefits derived therefrom. I wish to add that these difficulties have been felt by the Edavagais for a long time in the past, and that they have on various occasions represented to the Government that it is highly essential in the best interests of both the people living in the Edavagais and the holders thereof that some effective check is placed on these unauthorised and wanton encroachments. It is only with this purpose in view that they have come forward and have requested the legislature to consider their request in all its aspects and grant the necessary relief. Moreover, I may point out that the people who may, at some future time, become liable, if my friends would support the Law Member, can never be worse off than the people who break the law in Government *pakuthies*. As the great Dewan Mr. Shungrasubbier observed in another connection, such people, if at all, will only be at an advantage. The Government officers charged with the working of the provisions are sure to exercise closer scrutiny in these cases than in those in which Government are directly interested.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : Your time is up.

MR. K. C. RAJA RAJA VARMA : Sir, for the sake of argument I shall assume with the permission of the House that the Land Conservancy Regulation is already applicable to the unassessed lands within the limits of the Edavagais. What we have to consider in this matter is whether there is any probability of the Edavagais invoking the aid of this Regulation in effecting the eviction of people in large numbers from their plots or holdings. The utmost the holders of the Edavagais can do under such circumstances is to ask the provertikar to report to the Tahsildar of the taluk about the encroachment on or the unauthorised occupation of a *poramboke* waste land.

In cases where the encroachment on the *poramboke* or on the forests is detrimental to the best interests of the people and the conservation of such lands for the purposes intended for them is necessary for the convenience and use of the people and the holders of the Edavagais alike, I hope this House would only appreciate the action of the Edavagais in bringing to the notice of the authorities the existence of any such unauthorised occupations. Where such encroachments are in respect of ordinary waste lands, I wish to point out that there is nothing specially for the Edavagais to gain by resorting to the aid of this Regulation against such trespassers. All that the Edavagais are entitled to get from these lands is the Sirkar assessment which they would get under all circumstances by registering them in the names of the occupants.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The resort to this Regulation would not bring the Edavagais any additional advantages either in the shape of money or anything else; for the fines and other things which are imposed by the Regulation on the trespassers go to the Government, while only the land assessment can be claimed by the Edavagais which they are at liberty to do even without resorting to this Regulation. Moreover, they can never be sure of getting the occupants evicted even if the cases are reported to the taluk authorities, for the Regulation and the Rules framed thereunder (Rules 8 to 12) make it obligatory on the part of the Tahsildar in all cases and the Division Peishkar in *poramboke* cases to inspect the places and to consider fully whether such encroachments should be removed or not in the interests of all the people. It is only in cases where the encroachments are found to be highly objectionable that they should order the removal of the same. There is thus no need for fear on this account. In this connection, I may observe that these high officers would be inclined to exercise their powers under this Regulation only more sparingly than under other circumstances, *viz.*, in respect of similar cases in Government *pakuthies*, and that the trespassers in the Edavagai *pakuthies* are only, as the late Dewan observed, at an advantage over their brethren in Government *pakuthies*. It may be asked, Sir, why the Edavagais are then interested in getting the provisions of this Regulation to their areas also. I wish to state, from my place here and with a full sense of the responsibility I feel towards the people living in the Edavagais for their prosperity and welfare, that the Edavagais are only actuated by a desire to see that the unassessed lands which must be conserved in the best interests of the people themselves taken as a whole (such as village commons, forests, *porambokes*, etc.) are conserved for the purposes intended to be served by them, and that the law applicable to their lands is sufficient to check wanton aggressions on the part of mischievous people. The Edavagais are only glad to afford all facilities to the people to take to the cultivation and improvement of waste lands, for it is only by this method that they are able to increase their revenue. It is not possible for the holders of the Edavagais to go and occupy all the waste lands themselves. They generally allow these lands to be registered in favour of the people who cultivate and improve them, under the Puduval Rules passed by Government.

But there are a number of people who have trespassed upon the waste lands in these Edavagais, and who are now holding them without applying for any registry or taking any *pattah* for their lands. They enjoy these lands without being under the liability to pay even the lawful assessment due to the Edavagais. If summonses are issued to them to appear before the *pakuthi* or taluk office and take the *pattah* for their holdings, they are not obliged to obey the summons, for the Revenue Recovery Regulation would be applicable only to matters subsequent to the registry of the lands. It is in respect of such intractable people that the Edavagais feel the greatest difficulty in managing their Estates. They are now forced to suffer great loss by the wilful disobedience of these people to the laws. The only remedy now open to the Edavagais is to go to the civil courts and get a decree for declaration of their title

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[The Deputy President.]

and for evicting them from the plots concerned. The Edavagais do not wish a large number of suits being filed against the people living therein. What they do want is that these people should apply for registry of the lands they hold, should accept *pattahs* issued to them under the Puduval Rules, and pay the just and lawful rents due to the Edavagais. If they are not willing to do any of these things, but remain obstinate, I beg to submit that there must be a law enabling revenue officers to take back the lands from them. It is for this purpose that the Edavagais have asked for the amendments in question, and I appeal to the House to grant their request, which is only reasonable under the circumstances.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I wish to know whether, in the case of the so-called waste lands, there are not vast areas already under occupation (though unauthorised), in which valuable improvements have been made by tenants, and whether this does not apply to them also.

Also I want to know what is the period of the limitation that should apply to such cases—whether it is the fifty years' rule in regard to Government waste lands or whether it is the five years' rule in regard to private waste lands.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Raja Raja Varma, you may give your opinion on the first point as on a case of law. You may answer the other important question completely.

MR. K. C. RAJA RAJA VARMA: Some lands are under occupation; it is not the intention of the Edavagai authorities to evict the occupants of these. All that the Edavagai authorities want is that the occupants should have their lands brought under registry. The real position is that there is no law for enforcing these occupants to go to the *pakuthi* or the taluk cutcherry. The tenants are enjoying the lands for so many years; they do not pay the tax; and they do not come to the court even if summonses are issued.

MR. J. JOHN NIDIRY: Is this amendment brought forward to help that situation?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Indirectly.

MR. K. C. RAJA RAJA VARMA: This amendment would enable the Edavagai authorities to have the occupants either to take registry or to leave the land.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think, Mr. Raja Raja Varma, your time is up. You must resume your seat.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Sir, my question has not been fully answered. The commutation rate is eleven chackrams per *para*. Is it a fact that the Edavagai authorities get twenty-eight chackrams per *para*?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I do not think anybody can answer that question. They get their paddy at the market rate.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: I was keeping an open mind on this question and I desired more to listen and learn than to speak and convince. But Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai has sent me a requisition that I should also speak—and I must surely obey him. The question, Sir, is a very difficult one. I have always been of opinion that these noblemen's families are being put to great difficulties on account of the development of our law. All presumptions are being drawn against them, and because they are few in number those communities which are more numerous are dictating terms to them. I am not complaining against that. That is more or less the trend of a democratic movement. What I say is that these privileges have been granted to the Edavagai authorities for certain important services done to the Travancore Government. I am prepared to consider them as very estimable persons. Mr. Krishna Aiyar said that there must be equality of treatment, whether the party be a poor man or a rich man. I am also of that opinion, so that if there is any Bill brought into this Council to the effect that more rights and more powers should be given to one party than to another, I would certainly oppose that Bill.

There is one curious feature about the Bill which strikes me. Yesterday you heard Mr. Subba Aiyar and others speaking about freedom of contract; to-day they want protection of an aggressive character. Now if these Edavagai owners are put to difficulties in the enjoyment of landed property, I must say that it is the Government and the Government alone that have created this situation. The theory of land in Malabar is that anybody who enjoys it beneficially is the possessor and subsequently the owner. But you will find, Sir, that during the last 50 or 60 years, the Government have been assuming to themselves the function of owners; they were passing this Regulation and that Regulation, and at last this mischievous legislative activity culminated in the passing of the Land Conservancy Regulation of 1091. Now, our legislature gave the jenmies the right of ownership over certain lands. The Edavagai people also desire the same rights to be conferred upon them. In former days the occupants and owners depended for their mutual welfare on a reciprocity of good feeling; but to-day they dislike and distrust each other. The result is that in place of amity and usage the landlord asks for legislative protection. How are we then to move on lines of least resistance? How are we to help the Edavagai owner without detriment to the occupant? As far as I have been able to consider the question, the situation baulks an easy solution. From certain facts brought to light in the course of the discussion, I learn that these Edavagai waste lands have been in the occupation of people for more than twenty years. If the present Bill has got the purpose of evicting them, I must certainly oppose it. If it is intended to give the Edavagais large coercive powers, which they do not enjoy under the law, then also I must oppose the Bill. I would oppose the Bill for a third ground. When the Edavagai owners themselves admit that there are extensive tracts within the Edavagais which are not in the occupation of anybody

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai.]

at this time, I am against allowing the lands already occupied to follow those and be laid waste once again. And fourthly, when is it conceded that the criminal law is quite suitable for the purpose and the only alleged difficulty is to go to court within three months of the trespass, I am inclined to think that the Edavagai owners should be taught a little more alertness in the protection of their own interests. Sir, I have great respect for the Edavagai owners and I am exceedingly anxious to support their legal rights; I am in favour of giving them proper facilities to effect registries of lands when they are in the occupation of recalcitrant trespassers. But I am not for extending to the Edavagais the stringent provisions of the Land Conservancy Regulation—a Regulation which has to be modified without delay. Before I sit down, I have to place before this Council another feature. As I said at the beginning, the Regulation of 1091 relating to Land Conservancy—

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: We have nothing to do with it now. I think it does not arise here.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: Certainly it does, because of the mutuality of the mischief that has been advocated and maintained by means of that Regulation in the passing of which Mr. Subba Aiyar had a share.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I had as much share as Mr. Velu Pillai. He was present; but he did not raise his voice then.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: Yes. I was present in the Council along with others, some of whom are in this very Council. It is the rules passed by Government under that Regulation that created more hardships than the Regulation itself. And these rules could not have been anticipated at the time when the principle of the Regulation was discussed. Moreover, the subject came up on the first occasion, I believe, when I took my seat in the Council. However, I am glad that, if I did not oppost it then, I have the opportunity to examine its provisions in this Council with a non-official majority, as contrasted with the powerless non-official minority of the older council. Now the whole question requires reconsideration. It is not a case of jenmies or Edavagais. But it is a question of the rights and privileges of a vast majority of the subjects of His Highness the Maha Raja. A few months after that Regulation was passed, there had been representations in the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think, Mr. Velu Pillai, you are not to go in detail with reference to the history of it.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: If Mr. Subba Aiyar wants any kind of amendment, it must be a wholesale and wholesome one and not a piecemeal attempt in the wrong direction. I would, therefore, oppose this praticular Bill and request Mr. Subba Aiyar to prevent further difficulties by bringing in a really comprehensive measure.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: Sir, I have been carefully listening to Mr. Raja Raja Varma's able speech, but I am sorry to say I remain unconverted. He could not satisfactorily answer my question why the Chiefs of the Edavagai levy a very much higher tax—and that in kind—than the Government. Much water has flowed under all our bridges since Dewan Mr. Shungrasubbier of revered memory spoke on this matter. The days of differential treatment between patricians and plebians, as aptly stated by Mr. Krishna Aiyar, have passed away and we are living in an age of democracy, when every man, high or low, rich or poor, has to be given his rights. If the Bill wants to give relief to the landlord, it should also give relief to the tenant. If the landlord is to be protected against the misdeeds of his tenants, there is stronger reason why the tenant also should be protected against the rapacity of the former. In England, capital was feeding on labour till recently; but the elections have shown that labour is coming by its own. There should be a *meum et tuum* in everything, and we are here to see justice done as between man and man. For these reasons, I stoutly oppose this Bill.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN: It is scarcely five minutes to five now.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You may proceed if you want, Mr. Hoogewerf.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF: I have finished.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN: Sir, I oppose the principle of the Bill. My first ground is that the right of appeal is vested in the Land Revenue Commissioner, which is objectionable. This is not like summoning a man to attend in a court. It is a much more important matter. This is like hanging a man as it were. The whole estate of a man might be swept away by a stroke of the pen. So, such a power cannot be vested in the Land Revenue Commissioner.

The second reason why I oppose the principle of the Bill being accepted is that it is virtually extending the provisions of the present Land Conservancy Regulation to areas to which it does not apply. About the merits of that Regulation, very much has been said by my friend, Mr. Velu Pillai; and though he was a member of that Council, that Bill was passed.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: Not that I had no hand, but that I was not sufficiently on the alert.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We are not concerned with that.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN: Well, the Law Member was objecting to our referring to that Regulation in our Statute Book. I think that, when an amendment is sought to be introduced into that Regulation, the whole of it should be before the Council, and not merely that portion of the clause which is amended. So I think we have a right to question the propriety and the principle which is contained in that Regulation which is already in the Statute Book.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai.]

It is a Regulation which has interfered very much with the rights of private persons. I think, the sooner it is removed from the Statute Book, the better. That is also one of the grounds why I object to this Bill being accepted by the Council.

So far as the protection of the Edavagais is concerned, I think the owners are bound to be protected just as any other man. The question is whether they should be given the protection that is sought to be bestowed by the Land Conservancy Regulation and whether we are satisfied with the Land Conservancy Regulation. If we are satisfied with the provisions of the present Regulation as it is, I cannot see much reason why its provisions should not be extended to the Edavagais. It is because I seriously object to many of the provisions contained in the existing Land Conservancy Regulation that I object to the present amendment also. Because that injury has been committed in that case, it is no reason why it should be extended to areas where that injury does not prevail.

Then one more aspect of the question which I wish to point out is that my friend, Mr. K. C. Raja Raja Varma, by referring to the statement of Dewan Mr. Shungrasubbier, has appealed very much to our feelings; and I think if I had been in the Council thirty years ago, I would certainly have allowed the Bill to be read in Council. But thirty years have elapsed since that statement was made and if Mr. Shungrasubbier were alive to-day and would go and inspect the Edavagais and report that the conditions are exactly the same as those that prevailed in the good old days, then certainly we might consider the question. But, I think, the conditions have very much changed. For these reasons, I think the Bill cannot be read in Council.

MR. K. P. RAMAN PILLAI: I rise to make a few observations, for the chief reason that it would be awkward if I should have to say on a future occasion that I was not happy when this amendment Bill passed through the Legislative Council. From what I heard from Mr. Raja Raja Varma, I understand that matters are going on pretty well so far as the Kilimanur Chief is concerned. But I have my own doubts about the Edappalli Chief and the lands owned by him. There has been a lot of literature in the Malayalam journals about what was going on there and it does not reflect any credit on the skill of the Chief for the management of his affairs that such things should happen in a nobleman's house. After listening to my friend's speech, I rather pity the conditions of these Chiefs. But he is not able to appeal to my reason. So far as I know, the existing law itself has worked considerable hardship, inasmuch as the tenants of the Edappalli Chief are concerned. I have received reliable information from Kallupara and other places that the Land Conservancy Regulation itself—that is sub-section (2), which is now sought to be enlarged—has worked considerable hardship. Lands which had been held from time immemorial have been taken out of the hands of tenants; lands held as *Tiruvalam* have now been treated as unassessed waste lands for the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

simple reason that the Chief had no reliable records to produce before the Sirkar and establish his claims thereon. There is utter confusion in the accounts; and the accounts that are available are considered to be of an unreliable character. We have also to remember, when we undertake legislation on behalf of the Chiefs, that the Travancore Government have no control over the Chiefs or their subordinates. They are, as Mr. Raja Raja Varma pointed out, independent principalities. So that unless the Government take upon themselves some powers to control the action of the Chiefs and their subordinates, I fear it may be dangerous to extend this protection to them.

The Bill has also to be opposed for the reason that it tends to oust civil courts of their jurisdiction. In several Bills, we find that there is a mentality to oust either this Council or the civil courts, of their powers. That is not a healthy sign. So that the first thing for us is to know the extent of the unassessed waste lands that is now available, to locate them on the ground and to see how far there is encroachment on the Chiefs' lands, before any action is taken on this subject at all. After all, the Chiefs' contention seems to be that the tenants who stayed on the land without getting them registered are refusing to have the registry made or to pay the tax for the lands. For that, I think, such a provision as this amendment Bill is too elaborate and unnecessary.

We have also to consider what machinery of the Travancore Government would be able to do this *extra* work. The Tahsildar is already overburdened. Without the help of the Income-tax Inspector he is not able to help the Income-tax Commissioner. That being so, it is quite possible that, if we pass this Bill, Government might come and ask us for a temporary allotment for an establishment to evict these unhappy tenants who happened to encroach upon the so-called unassessed waste lands of the Edavagai Chiefs. Once we pass it, we shall be making ourselves inconsistent if we do not allow the grant to be made.

The provision regarding the appeal to the Land Revenue Commissioner has already been referred to by my previous speakers. On the whole, I think, after an enquiry of the kind I previously suggested, if the Bill is brought sometime later, I daresay we will have it accepted.

MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR: Before I proceed with the subject, I would request the Law Member to enlighten me if the Jenmi-Kudiyan Regulation corresponds to the Estates Land Act in British India. If it is not so, if the proprietors or *mittadars*, and tenants or *pattadars*, do not correspond to the jenmies and tenants in Travancore, I think it would be advisable for the House to know what exactly the comparison of rights and liabilities is. If so, I would request the Law Member to postpone this Bill, till we get a proper knowledge of the Estates Land Act in British India.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: I rise to a point of order. It is not information that he wants, but enlightenment on a subject. I object to that.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. S. Paramesvara Aiyar.]

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: He was opposing the principle. He said that, until we got information, we should not proceed with the Bill. I think that may be allowed.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Sir, I believe that very many objections raised have, to a certain extent, been answered by my friends, Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai and Mr. K. C. Raja Raja Varma. Mr. K. Parameswaran Pillai raised a query, *viz.*, whether the amendment is intended to apply to persons who are actually in possession of the lands, and whether they would be evicted, and, if so, whether any safeguards would be put in. If the Council accepts the principle of the Bill, every possible safeguard necessary in matters affecting the rights of the present occupants would, as far as possible, be introduced into it. All members here, I doubt not, have recognised the difficulty pointed out by Mr. Raja Raja Varma. The tenants would be in possession; but they would not pay rent; and they would not apply for registration. For every small matter a suit would have to be filed, although the Chiefs have surrendered their permanent rights of occupancy and the rent is recoverable according to the Revenue Recovery Regulation. With reference to the persons in possession the necessary safeguards may be made, and the Bill, when passed, may be made applicable to future unauthorised occupations. If that will satisfy the House, I can assure that that can be put in.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: What about the appellate authority?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I am not going to say anything about that. I am speaking of the first portion. If the sense of the House is that the principle of the Bill may be accepted, the necessary safeguards can be put in so that existing rights are not affected. It is a matter seriously to be taken into consideration and it is for the Council to decide it.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: If Mr Subba Aiyar is prepared to introduce a comprehensive Bill amending the whole Land Conservancy Regulation—

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: I am not prepared to give any such promise.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: I must offer a word of explanation. In order to give our vote, we must be satisfied with some assurance.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think that answer is not going to help you in giving your vote.

Gentlemen, I shall now put the question to the vote. The question is that the principle of the Bill be accepted.

The motion was put and lost, 20 voting *for*, and 21 *against*.

MR. S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR: May I demand a poll?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

A poll was taken with the following result.

AYES—20.

Mr. K. Anantanarayana Aiyar.
„ I. C. Chacko.
„ R. Dhanukoti Pillai.
„ K. V. Natesa Aiyar.
„ K. George.
„ L. C. Hodgson.
„ R. Krishna Pillai.
„ Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.
Dewan Bahadur Dr. P. N. Lakshmanan.
Mr. S. Paramesvara Aiyar.
Mr. W. H. Pitt.
„ M. Raja Raja Varama.
Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.
Mr. V. Subba Aiyar.
„ A. J. Van Ross.
„ T. Lakshmana Pillai.
„ P. K. Narayana Pillai
„ P. Paramesvaran.
„ K. C. Raja Raja Varma.
„ Trivikramar Vasudevar.

NOES—21.

Mr. T. M. Chidambaratanu Pillai.
„ Paul V. Daniel.
„ A. Govinda Menon.
„ A. Hoogewerf.
„ M. K. Khadir Pillai.
„ C. P. Kochukunju Pillai.
„ S. Krishna Aiyar.
„ T. Kumara Pillai.
„ Tariatu Kunjitomman.
„ V. Kunjukrishna Pillai.
The Rev. Fr. Kuriakose Vettikkappalli.
Mr. M. R. Madhava Variar.
„ J. John Nidiry.
„ N. Padmanabha Pillai.
„ Joseph Panjikaran.
„ K. Paramesvaran Pillai.
„ G. Paramesvaran Pillai.
„ C. Ramankunju.
„ K. P. Raman Pillai.
„ Dominic Tomman.
„ T. K. Velu Pillai.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I would not exercise my vote in this matter at all. It is a matter of principle in legislation that there should be no interference with the jurisdiction of civil courts except under exceptional circumstances and I did not want to prejudice the judgment of the Council in any respect until I knew what the result was. There is nothing extraordinary in it. It is only an ordinary principle—what all lawyers can appreciate.

The Bill was rejected.

THE VILLAGE PANCHAYAT BILL.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Sir, I should like to get through the Village Panchayat Bill, if the Council has no serious objection.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Does the House agree to Mr. Subba Aiyar's introducing the Village Panchayat Bill to-day? If it is a non-contentious measure, he will introduce it.

MR. T. K VELU PILLAI: I must tell the Law Member that it is a very contentious measure.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly